

Attorney Docket: 112.P14193

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 13 2006****REMARKS****Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13 and 15-21 are pending in the above-referenced patent application. In this response, claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-11 and 13 have been amended, claims 12 and 14 have been cancelled and claims 16-21 have been added. Assignee has amended the claims in order to more clearly delineate intended subject matter. It is noted that claims were not amended to overcome the rejections and objections, or in light of the cited references. Furthermore, it is believed that these amendments do not narrow claim scope. Rather, in some circumstances, the claims may even be broadened. Therefore, no prosecution history estoppel should result from these claim amendments. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that adequate support may be found in the specification for new claims 16-21. For example, adequate support may be found at least from page 5, line 20 to page 8, line 3 and Figures 1 and 2.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102(e)

In the Final Office Action, dated January 20, 2006, and the Advisory Action, dated April 5, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 7-15 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujimoto (US Patent No. 5,966,468). This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is noted that claims 12 and 14 have been cancelled, and therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot.

Assignee respectfully submits that Fujimoto does not disclose each and every element of the rejected claims, as amended, and, therefore, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the claims are not anticipated by Fujimoto under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). As just an example, referring to claims 1-5 and 7-8, as amended, Fujimoto does not show or describe at least, "an image-processing component adapted to generate data to display a preliminary scanned image of a document, and further adapted to receive a selection of a scanning zone of the preliminary scanned image, wherein the scanning zone comprises less than the entire preliminary scanned image, and further adapted to receive a selection of at least one sub-zone of the scanning zone, wherein selection of a sub-zone comprises designation of an

arbitrary area of the scanning zone, and wherein selection of a sub-zone further comprises designation of a compression model for the sub-zone" as recited in claim 1.

Fujimoto is directed toward dividing regions of an image, setting encoding methods for the various regions, and displaying communication charges along with the divided regions. Fujimoto does not teach or suggest selection of a scanning zone, where the scanning zone comprises less than the entire image. Additionally, Fujimoto does not teach or suggest designation of an arbitrary area of the scanning zone, as recited in claim 1, as amended. In Fujimoto, regions of an image are automatically divided in accordance with image features, and there is no teaching or suggesting of selecting an arbitrary area of a scanning zone. For example, as stated from col 2:17 – 2:24 of Fujimoto, "an image processing apparatus including input means for inputting an image, dividing means for **dividing the image into a plurality of image regions in accordance with image features**, setting means for setting encoding methods in units of image regions divided by the dividing means, **display means for displaying region information including information indicating the encoding method set by the setting means in units of image regions**". (emphasis supplied). Additionally, as stated from 4:42 – 5:11, "In step S402, the original is prescanned by, e.g., a color scanner (not shown) in the image input unit 201 in accordance with an instruction from the CPU 207, and R, G, and B multi-value image data are input. Based on the input data, color and monochrome regions are discriminated, and the image is divided into regions. ... the flow advances to step S405, and predicted communication charges in units of regions are displayed on the display unit 205 in accordance with an instruction from the CPU 207."

As can be seen from the cited portions of Fujimoto, the image is scanned, regions are discriminated, and then regions are presented as divided regions having associated charges. The image is divided into a plurality of image regions in accordance with image features, and not in an arbitrary manner, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, there is no contemplation of selecting an arbitrary region of a scanning zone, and, additionally, there is no contemplation of selection of a sub-zone, wherein selection of the sub-zone comprises designation of a compression model for the sub-zone. Fujimoto clearly describes discriminating regions of a scanned image, setting encoding methods for the various regions, and then displaying communication charges for the discriminated regions. The image

in Fujimoto that is displayed is an image including discriminated regions, and there is no teaching or suggestion of designating arbitrary sub-zones as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Assignee respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons presented above, Fujimoto does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, and, therefore, a sufficient showing of anticipation has not been established. It is noted that many other bases for traversing the rejection could be provided, but Assignee believes that this ground is sufficient. Additionally, it is respectfully requested that claims 2-5 and 7-8 are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as presented for claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejections of these claims, and allow these claims to proceed to allowance.

Additionally, referring to claims 9-11, 13 and 15, as amended, Fujimoto does not show or describe at least, "pre-scanning an object to obtain a preliminary scanned image including a scanning zone; providing scanning zone data to a computing system adapted to perform a chrominance and luminance analysis of at least a portion of the scanning zone; and displaying a plurality of user-selectable sub-zones each having a plurality of user-selectable compression ratios, wherein the sub-zones and compression ratios are determined based at least in part on chrominance and luminance data provided by the computing system" as recited in claim 9.

As mentioned previously, Fujimoto is directed toward dividing regions of an image, setting encoding methods for the various regions, and displaying communication charges along with the divided regions. Fujimoto does not teach or suggest employing a chrominance and luminance analysis to determine compression ratios. For example, as stated from col 2:17 – 2:20 of Fujimoto, "an image processing apparatus including input means for inputting an image, dividing means for **dividing the image into a plurality of image regions in accordance with image features**" (emphasis supplied). Additionally, as stated from 4:42 – 5:11, "In step S402, the original is prescanned by, e.g., a color scanner (not shown) in the image input unit 201 in accordance with an instruction from the CPU 207, and R, G, and B multi-value image data are input. Based on the input data, color and monochrome regions are discriminated, and the image is divided into regions. ... the flow advances to step S405, and predicted communication charges in units of regions are displayed on the display unit 205 in accordance with an instruction from the CPU 207." As can be seen from the cited portions of Fujimoto,

Attorney Docket: 112.P14193

there is no contemplation of employing a chrominance and luminance analysis to determine compression ratios, as recited in claim 9, as amended.

Assignee respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons presented above, Fujimoto does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 9, and, therefore, a sufficient showing of anticipation has not been established. It is noted that many other bases for traversing the rejection could be provided, but Assignee believes that this ground is sufficient. Additionally, it is respectfully requested that claims 10-11, 13 and 15 are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as presented for claim 9. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejections of these claims, and allow these claims to proceed to allowance.

Additionally, new claims 16-21 are in a condition for allowance for the same and/or similar reasons as presented above. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner allow these claims to proceed to allowance.

Attorney Docket: 112.P14193

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims pending in this patent application, as amended, are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, she is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 439-6500. Reconsideration of this patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account number 50-3703.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

7/13/06



Michael J. Willardson
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 50,856

Berkeley Law and Technology Group, LLC
1700 NW 167th Place, Suite 240
Beaverton, OR 97006
Customer No. 00043831

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on:

July 13, 2006

Date of Transmission

Michelle Turner

Name of Person Transmitting Correspondence



Signature